

**REMARKS**

The Office Action of June 9, 2006, has been received and reviewed.

Claims 25-32 and 64-66 are currently pending and under consideration in the above-referenced application. Each of claims 25-30, 64, and 65 stands rejected, while claims 31, 32, and 66 are drawn to allowable subject matter.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

**Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement**

Please note that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed in the above-referenced application on May 19, 2005, but that the undersigned attorney has not yet received any indication that the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement have been considered in the above-referenced application. It is respectfully requested that the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement of May 19, 2005, be considered and made of record in the above-referenced application and that an initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08A that accompanied that Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement be returned to the undersigned attorney as evidence of such consideration.

If any of the documents or any portion thereof is not available to the Office, the undersigned attorney would be happy to supply a copy thereof to the Office.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 25-30, 64, and 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for being drawn to subject matter that is allegedly anticipated by the disclosure of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0168342 of Chakravorty et al. (hereinafter "Chakravorty"). It appears, based on the publication date of Chakravorty and the filing date of the above-referenced application, that this rejection should have been made under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single reference which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053

(Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

With respect to the intermediate semiconductor component of independent claim 25, as amended and presented herein, it is respectfully submitted that Chakravorty lacks any express or inherent description of a via that includes filler material that is “circumscribed by and contacting [an] annular conductive layer” within the via, “occupying a remainder of the via . . .”

Instead, the description of Chakravorty is limited to a via with a first electrode 320, a dielectric layer 330, and a second electrode 335. *See, e.g.*, FIG. 3D; paragraphs [0043] through [0046]. Although the dielectric layer 330 is circumscribed by and contacts the first electrode 320, the dielectric layer 330 does not occupy a remainder of the via. *See, e.g.*, FIG. 3C; paragraph [0045]. Rather, the second electrode 335 occupies the remainder of the via. *See, e.g.*, FIG. 3D; paragraph [0046].

Therefore, Chakravorty does not anticipate each and every element of amended independent claim 25, as would be required to maintain the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of that claim.

Claims 26-30 are each allowable, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 25, which is allowable.

As for independent claim 64, it is respectfully submitted that Chakravorty does not expressly or inherently describe an intermediate semiconductor component with at least one via that includes solder. It has been asserted that Chakravorty describes that the second electrode 335 of the via 305 described therein may comprise solder. Office Action of June 9, 2006, page 3. It is respectfully submitted, however, that Chakravorty includes no such disclosure. Rather, the disclosure of Chakravorty is limited to a second electrode 335 that may be formed by conductive paste that is *cured*, indicating that some polymerization occurs to form the second electrode 335 (paragraph [0046]), or that electroplating, physical vapor deposition, or chemical vapor deposition processes may be employed to form a hollow second electrode 335 (paragraphs [0047], [0022]). As such, Chakravorty does not anticipate each and every element of the intermediate semiconductor component recited in independent claim 64. It is, therefore,

respectfully submitted that, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the subject matter to which independent claim 64 is drawn is allowable over the subject matter described in Chakravorty.

Claim 65 is allowable, among other reasons, for depending directly from independent claim 64, which is allowable.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections of claims 25-30, 64, and 65 is respectfully solicited, as is the allowance of each of these claims.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The indication that claims 31, 32, and 66 recite allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. None of these claims has been amended to independent form, as it is believed that the claims from which they depend are allowable.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 25-32 and 64-66 is allowable. An early notice of the allowability of each of these claims is respectfully solicited, as is an indication that the above-referenced application has been passed for issuance. If any issues preventing allowance of the above-referenced application remain which might be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Office is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Brick G. Power  
Registration No. 38,581  
Attorney for Applicant  
TRASKBRITT, PC  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: September 11, 2006

BGP/djp:eg

Document in ProLaw